



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/924,376 | 08/08/2001 | Gregory J. Franz | 12055-0004 | 1775 |
| 7590 | 08/25/2005 | | EXAMINER | LY, ANH |
| PAUL E. FRANZ 54 VISTA RIDGE CIRCLE HINCKLEY, OH 44233 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2162 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/924,376 | FRANZ, GREGORY J. |
| | Examiner Anh Ly | Art Unit 2162 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08/08/2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's Response filed on 05/27/2005.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 05/27/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground rejection set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

3. Claims 1-54 are pending in this Application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 10, 11-14, 19, 20-23, 26, 32-34, 35-38, 43-45, 46-49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,505,214 issued to Sherman et al. (hereinafter Sherman) in view of US Patent No. 5,822,526 issued to Waskiewicz and further in view of US Patent No.: 6,453,353 issued to Win et al. (hereinafter Win).

With respect to claim 1, Sherman discloses associating a plurality of classes arranged in a class hierarchy (an e-mail folder hierarchy includes its subfolders, each folder is a class in the e-mail folder hierarch, see fig. 5 and figs 8A and 8B: col. 7, lines 52-60 and col. 8, lines 42-67);

associating a plurality of data sets with the plurality of classes (see fig. 5, fig. 8A and fig. 8B, the fold name is a class such as IMAP4 Mail, Inbox, Outbox and Sent and attachments as datasets: col. 7, lines 1-12);

creating a plurality of recipient data sets (attachments such as graphic files: col. 7, lines 8-12) by associating each data set associated with a class so that each recipient

data set includes only data sets (attachments: col. 7, lines 1-12; also see col. 8, lines 12-20 and col. 9, lines 4-28);

and distributing the plurality of recipient data sets to the corresponding plurality of recipients (addressee: col. 7, lines 5-7).

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach the plurality of recipient accounts.

However, Waskiewicz discloses recipients' address directory as shown in the fig. 3, user names as classes in the e-mail folders hierarchy (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15; also see col. 5, lines 3-10 and col. 4, lines 5-10).

Therefore, based on Sherman in view of Waskiewicz, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman and Waskiewicz, because using the steps of "the plurality of recipient accounts" would have given those skilled in the art to have ability to include a directory comprising a set of recipient entities associated with the set of e-mail entities in the distribution data to a plurality of recipients associated with each corresponding recipient account. This gives users the advantage of processing of the

plurality of recipient accounts more efficiently. Sherman and Waskiewicz do not teach each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account.

However, Win teaches each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account by defining users, administrative roles, user and group in the access server and registry server from which the user or group may access or receive the resources such as email and attached files as the administrator distributes based on the functional and roles that are defined in the system (col. 13, lines 54-67, col. 15, lines 35-67 and col. 16, lines 1-30; also see figs. 10).

Therefore, based on Sherman in view of Waskiewicz, and further in view of Win, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win to the system of Sherman to distribute data or email or web resources to a plurality of recipients associated with a corresponding plurality of recipient accounts based on the resources, roles of the users and functional groups in the organization or company that are associated with the user. Because using the steps of "each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to distribute attached files associated with corresponding recipient accounts. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing attached files to each recipient and only the attached file associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claims 2-4 and 10, Sherman discloses a method of distributing data as discussed in claim 1. Also Sherman discloses class hierarchy and a parent-child relationship and data set (see figs 5, 8A and 8B and folds and subfolders are representing a parent-child relationship: col. 8, lines 12-67; attachment files: col. 7, lines 5-12) and (client/server network including Internet e-mail server: see fig. 1, item 28 and col. 4, lines 10-48).

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach the plurality of recipient accounts.

However, Waskiewicz discloses recipients' address directory as shown in the fig. 3: user names as classes in the e-mail folders hierarchy (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15; also see col. 5, lines 3-10 and col. 4, lines 5-10).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sherman with the teachings of Waskiewicz by incorporating the use of the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15). The motivation being for

distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments by using an e-mail folder hierarchy and a predetermined user to a particular folder of the hierarchy are defined (Sherman – col. 2, lines 40-67) and to distribute data or email or web resources to a plurality of recipients associated with a corresponding plurality of recipient accounts based on the resources, roles of the users and functional groups in the organization or company that are associated with the user.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 10 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 10 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 20, Sherman discloses a computer storage medium storing a data structure and a program (see fig. 5 and figs. 8A and 8B: data structure or e-mail folder hierarchy and application program or e-mail software);

a computer system having access to the computer storage medium and configured to execute the application program (storage device is storing e-mail messages: col. 4, lines 31-67, and col. 5, lines 1-36; also see figs. 1 and 2; application program: col. 6, lines 6-25);

wherein the data structure includes a plurality of classes arranged in a class hierarchy, and associated with the plurality of classes (see figs. 5, 8A and 8B: folder and each fold name in the e-mail folder hierarchy is a class, such as inbox, outbox, sent); and wherein the program associates data sets to selected classes and creates a plurality of recipient data sets by associating data sets associated with the selected class, and distributes the plurality of recipient data sets to the corresponding plurality of recipients (attachments such as graphic files: col. 7, lines 1-12; also see col. 8, lines 12-20 and col. 9, lines 4-28 and addressee: col. 7, lines 5-7).

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing

electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach the plurality of recipient accounts.

However, Waskiewicz discloses recipients' address directory as shown in the fig. 3, user names as classes in the e-mail folders hierarchy (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15; also see col. 5, lines 3-10 and col. 4, lines 5-10).

Therefore, based on Sherman in view of Waskiewicz, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman and Waskiewicz, because using the steps of "the plurality of recipient accounts" would have given those skilled in the art to have ability to include a directory comprising a set of recipient entities associated with the set of e-mail entities in the distribution data to a plurality of recipients associated with each corresponding recipient account. This gives users the advantage of processing of the plurality of recipient accounts more efficiently. Sherman and Waskiewicz do not teach each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account.

However, Win teaches each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account by defining users, administrative roles, user and group in the access server and registry server from which the user or group may access or receive the resources such as email and attached files as the administrator distributes based on the functional and roles that are defined in the system (col. 13, lines 54-67, col. 15, lines 35-67 and col. 16, lines 1-30; also see figs. 10).

Therefore, based on Sherman in view of Waskiewicz, and further in view of Win, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win to the system of Sherman to distribute data or email or web resources to a plurality of recipients associated with a corresponding plurality of recipient accounts based on the resources, roles of the users and functional groups in the organization or company that are associated with the user. Because using the steps of "each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to distribute attached files associated with corresponding recipient accounts. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing attached files to each recipient and only the attached file associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claims 21-23, Sherman discloses an apparatus for distributing data as discussed in claim 20. Also Sherman discloses class hierarchy and a parent-child relationship and data set (see figs 5, 8A and 8B and folds and subfolders are representing a parent-child relationship: col. 8, lines 12-67; attachment files: col. 7, lines 5-12) and (client/server network including Internet e-mail server: see fig. 1, item 28 and col. 4, lines 10-48).

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder

storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach the plurality of recipient accounts.

However, Waskiewicz discloses recipients' address directory as shown in the fig. 3: user names as classes in the e-mail folders hierarchy (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15; also see col. 5, lines 3-10 and col. 4, lines 5-10).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sherman with the teachings of Waskiewicz by incorporating the use of the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15). The motivation being for distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments by using an e-mail folder hierarchy and a predetermined user to a particular folder of the hierarchy are defined (Sherman – col. 2, lines 40-67) and to distribute data or email or web resources to a plurality of recipients associated with a corresponding plurality of recipient accounts based on the resources, roles of the users and functional groups in the organization or company that are associated with the user.

With respect to claim 26, Sherman discloses further comprising a transaction file stored on the computer storage medium, the transaction file storing a transaction history of the distribution of data sets (attachments such as graphic files: col. 7, lines 1-12).

Art Unit: 2162

With respect to claims 32-34, Sherman discloses an apparatus for distributing data as discussed in claim 20. Also Sherman discloses class hierarchy and a parent-child relationship and data set (see figs 5, 8A and 8B and folds and subfolders are representing a parent-child relationship: col. 8, lines 12-67; attachment files: col. 7, lines 5-12) and (client/server network including Internet e-mail server: see fig. 1, item 28 and col. 4, lines 10-48).

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach the plurality of recipient accounts.

However, Waskiewicz discloses recipients' address directory as shown in the fig. 3: user names as classes in the e-mail folders hierarchy (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15; also see col. 5, lines 3-10 and col. 4, lines 5-10).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sherman with the teachings of Waskiewicz by incorporating the use of the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15). The motivation being for

distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments by using an e-mail folder hierarchy and a predetermined user to a particular folder of the hierarchy are defined (Sherman – col. 2, lines 40-67) and to distribute data or email or web resources to a plurality of recipients associated with a corresponding plurality of recipient accounts based on the resources, roles of the users and functional groups in the organization or company that are associated with the user.

With respect to claim 35, Sherman discloses creating a data set for each recipient in the class, and distributing the data sets to the recipients associating a first file with a class of recipients (see figs. 5, 8A and 8B, the class in the e-mail folders hierarchy are inbox, outbox and sent: col. 9, lines 4-37 and col. 12, lines 25-67; and data sets such as attachments in the e-mail, graphic, video audio files: col. 7, lines 1-12).

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach associating a first file with a class of recipients; associating a second file with one recipient in the class. .

However, Waskiewicz discloses email directory having subdirectories and each subdirectory is a class of the recipient, recipient's user name, and user name is a file with a class of recipient (see fig. 3 and col. 3-18).

Therefore, based on Sherman in view of Waskiewicz, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman and Waskiewicz, because using the steps of "associating a first file with a class of recipients; associating a second file with one recipient in the class" would have given those skilled in the art to have ability to include a directory comprising a set of recipient entities associated with the set of e-mail entities in the distribution data to a plurality of recipients associated with each corresponding recipient account. This gives users the advantage of processing of the plurality of recipient accounts more efficiently. Sherman and Waskiewicz do not teach each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account.

However, Win teaches each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account by defining users, administrative roles, user and group in the access server and registry server from which the user or group may access or receive the resources such as email and attached files as the administrator distributes based on the functional and roles that are defined in the system (col. 13, lines 54-67, col. 15, lines 35-67 and col. 16, lines 1-30; also see figs. 10).

Therefore, based on Sherman in view of Waskiewicz, and further in view of Win, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Win to the system of Sherman to distribute data or email or web resources to a plurality of recipients associated with a corresponding plurality of recipient accounts based on the resources, roles of the users and functional groups in the organization or company that are associated with the user. Because using the steps of “each recipient data set includes only data sets associated with each corresponding recipient account” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to distribute attached files associated with corresponding recipient accounts. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing attached files to each recipient and only the attached file associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claims 36-38, Sherman discloses creating a hierarchy of classes including the class, associating the first file includes defining recipients to include all recipients in the class and all recipients in any subordinate classes related to the class in the hierarchy, and wherein the classes in the hierarchy are arranged in a parent-child relationship (see fig. 5, figs. 8A and 8B: the relationship of member class in the e-mail fold hierarchy such as the parent of Inbox or Outbox or Sent is IMAP4 Mail).

With respect to claims 43, Sherman discloses wherein the step of distributing the data sets includes the step of sending a single e-mail to each recipient including a data set corresponding to the recipient (col. 7, lines 4-22).

With respect to claims 44-45, Sherman discloses a method of e-mail files as discussed in claim 35.

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach the plurality of recipient accounts.

However, Waskiewicz discloses recipients' address directory as shown in the fig. 3: user names as classes in the e-mail folders hierarchy (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15; also see col. 5, lines 3-10 and col. 4, lines 5-10).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sherman with the teachings of Waskiewicz by incorporating the use of the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15). The motivation being for distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments by using an e-mail folder hierarchy and a predetermined user to a particular folder of the hierarchy are defined (Sherman – col. 2, lines 40-67) and to distribute data or email or web resources to a plurality of recipients associated with a corresponding plurality of recipient accounts based on the resources, roles of the users and functional groups in the organization or company that are associated with the user.

Claim 46 is essentially the same as claim 35 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 35 hereinabove.

Claim 47 is essentially the same as claim 36 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 36 hereinabove.

Claim 48 is essentially the same as claim 37 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 37 hereinabove.

Claim 49 is essentially the same as claim 38 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 38 hereinabove.

Claim 54 is essentially the same as claim 43 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 43 hereinabove.

6. Claims 5-9, 15-18, 24-25, 27-31, 39-42, and 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,505,214 issued to Sherman et al. (hereinafter Sherman) in view of US Patent No. 5,822,526 issued to Waskiewicz further in view of US Patent No.: 6,453,353 issued to Win et al. (hereinafter Win) and US Patent No. 6,345,288 issued to Reed et al. (hereinafter Reed).

With respect to claims 5-6, Sherman in view of Waskiewicz and Win discloses a method of distributing data as discussed in claim 1.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win do not teach defining an event and an occurrence of the event.

However, Reed discloses event operation for emails or mails or messages (col. 41, lines 42-67 and col. 4, lines 4-24; also see col. 85, lines 28-67).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event" would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing

an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claims 7-9, Sherman in view of Waskiewicz and Win discloses a method of distributing data as discussed in claim 1.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win do not teach a distribution frequency threshold.

However, Reed discloses the frequency of threshold for distributing interest or desired message to the user or consumers (col. 41-64).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event" would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 7 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 9 hereinabove.

With respect to claims 24-25 and 30-31, Sherman in view of Waskiewicz and Win discloses an apparatus of distributing data as discussed in claim 20.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win do not teach defining an event and an occurrence of the event.

However, Reed discloses event operation for emails or mails or messages (col. 41, lines 42-67 and col. 4, lines 4-24; also see col. 85, lines 28-67).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the

message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event" would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claims 27-28, Sherman in view of Waskiewicz and Win discloses an apparatus of distributing data as discussed in claim 20.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win do not teach a distribution frequency threshold.

However, Reed discloses the frequency of threshold for distributing interest or desired message to the user or consumers (col. 41-64).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event"

would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claim 29, Sherman discloses an apparatus for distributing data as discussed in claim 20. Also Sherman discloses class hierarchy and a parent-child relationship and data set (see figs 5, 8A and 8B and folds and subfolders are representing a parent-child relationship: col. 8, lines 12-67; attachment files: col. 7, lines 5-12) and (client/server network including Internet e-mail server: see fig. 1, item 28 and col. 4, lines 10-48).

Sherman discloses the object set is a set of certain information items, such as folders in an e-mail folder hierarchy (col. 2, lines 37-50). These items are stored in a hierarchy of folders, where each top level folder of the hierarchy is associated with the user account and the messaging system is capable of handling messages in that folder storage architecture as well as the newer hierarchical folder storage architectures (col. 5, lines 3-8) and facilitating e-mail operations such as sending, receiving and organizing electronic mail messages as well as addressee. Sherman does not explicitly teach the plurality of recipient accounts.

However, Waskiewicz discloses recipients' address directory as shown in the fig. 3: user names as classes in the e-mail folders hierarchy (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15; also see col. 5, lines 3-10 and col. 4, lines 5-10).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event" would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claims 39-40, Sherman in view of Waskiewicz and Win discloses a method of e-mailing files as discussed in claim 35.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win do not teach defining an event and an occurrence of the event.

However, Reed discloses event operation for emails or mails or messages (col. 41, lines 42-67 and col. 4, lines 4-24; also see col. 85, lines 28-67).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the

message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event" would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claim 41, Sherman in view of Waskiewicz and Win discloses a method of e-mailing files as discussed in claim 35.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win do not teach a distribution frequency threshold.

However, Reed discloses the frequency of threshold for distributing interest or desired message to the user or consumers (col. 41-64).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event"

would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

With respect to claim 42, Sherman in view of Waskiewicz and Win discloses a method of e-mailing files as discussed in claim 35.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Sherman, Waskiewicz and Win do not teach compressing the data sets.

However, Reed discloses the encoding message into a computer format (col. 12, lines 45-49 and col. 14, lines 50-60).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Sherman in view of Waskiewicz with the teachings of Reed by incorporating the use of the event for the message object with an associated schedule event (col. 85, lines 42-50) and the recipient mailing address or recipients' address directory such as emails' addressee, user name and mailbox logical address (see fig. 3, (col. 5, lines 66-67 and col. 6, lines 1-15), because using the steps of "defining an event and an occurrence of the event" would have given those skilled in the art the ability to define easily the event and an occurrence of the event. This gives users the advantage of processing time for defining event more efficiently. The motivation being to reduce the processing time of distributing

an email message attaching one or more attachments to each recipient and only the attached files associated with each corresponding recipient account.

Claim 50 is essentially the same as claim 39 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 39 hereinabove.

Claim 51 is essentially the same as claim 40 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 40 hereinabove.

Claim 52 is essentially the same as claim 41 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 41 hereinabove.

Claim 53 is essentially the same as claim 42 except that it is directed to a program rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 42 hereinabove.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to **(571) 273-4039**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center **(571) 273-8300**

ANH LY
JUL. 28th, 2005

John E. Breene
JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2400